REMARKS

Claims 1-64 were pending. Claims 1, 19-34 and 50 have been amended to further clarify the nature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 1-64 remain pending subsequent entry of the present amendment.

In the present Office Action, claim 1-11, 19-28, 30-44, 46-63 and 65-68 stand rejected under 35 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,929,849 (hereinafter "Kikinis"). In addition, claims 12-18, 29, 45 and 64 stand rejected under 35 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,903 (hereinafter "Balakrishnan"). Applicant traverses the above rejections and submits the claims recite features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the following discussion.

As noted above, the claims have been amended to clarify the nature of the claimed invention. Generally speaking, the claims have been clarified to recite features generally directed to *automating user input*. None of the cited art discloses or suggests such a notion.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method which includes:

"executing an interactive application corresponding to a program;
providing an opportunity for the display of added content, wherein said added
        content is provided in response to user input;
providing automated input corresponding to said opportunity, wherein said
        automated input is provided by a script in lieu of said user input; and
providing said added content for display in response to detecting said automated
        input."

In the claim above, it is seen that an opportunity for the display of added content is provided and that it is provided in response to user input. However, the claim further recites that a script provides automated input corresponding to the opportunity - in lieu of the user input. Responsive to the automated input, the added content is displayed.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Kikinis is generally directed to a system for embedding web page URLs in a television signal. In particular, Kikinis discloses embedding an image (or data describing a portion of an image) and associated URL between frames of a transmitted signal. The embedded image, such as an icon, is displayed. If a user activates the image/icon, the associated URL is utilized to access a corresponding website. For example, Kikinis discloses:

> "In frame-by-frame transmissions, as is known in the art, it is known to transmit information in the space between frames. . . .
>
> In various embodiments of the present invention one or more entity images in frames of a transmission are identified as to position and extent in the frame, and are associated with a WWW URL. As a simplified example, in an advertisement for a certain brand of automobile, an icon or emblem may be presented in each frame at a particular position in the frame. The emblem could be, for example, the specific emblem used for that brand of automobile, ...
>
> In this example the BMW advertisement is a pre-recorded advertisement that may be transmitted any number of times and displayed, just as advertisements are typically displayed between portions of TV programs. In the recording of the advertisement, or in an editing procedure for existing pre-recorded advertisements, data is recorded to be transmitted between frames identifying the position and extent of the BMW emblem in the adjacent frame, and associating the emblem with a specific WWW URL, of the general form http://www.bmw.com. The URL is a locator on the WWW for a Home Page provided on a WEB server maintained by BMW, and being a repository for detailed information in addition to that provided in the transmitted advertisement.
>
> . . .
>
> In a system with a CPU and a memory, and also equipped with special control routines according to an embodiment of the invention, the BMW emblem is treated as an interactive screen region in a manner familiar to persons who use access WEB pages. The computer system integrated with the TV circuitry displays a cursor 70 on the screen which may be positioned by a user via positioning buttons 67 on hand-held remote 63 (see FIG. 1). . . .
>
> If the viewer is interested in additional information, he/she may manipulate the cursor to touch the region of emblem 57 and then

actuate a selection signal, such as pressing one of the buttons 69 on the remote. On receipt of the selection signal with the cursor touching the BMW emblem, the system executes browser routines, accessing the WWW, and dials up the WEB server (see server 54 and modem 35 or 39, FIG. 1) described above maintained by BMW on the WWW. The URL in the data region between frames of the TV transmission, associated with the BMW emblem is the WWW address for dial-up." (Kikinis, col. 6, line 41 – col. 7, line 67).

In the above, and in all of Kikinis, a user actively provides input in order to display additional content. There is no teaching or suggestion of a script which provides automated input in lieu of the user input. Similarly, Balakrishnan provides no such teaching or suggestion. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited art. As each of claims 19, 34 and 50 include features similar to that of claim 1, each of claims 19, 34 and 50 are patentably distinct for similar reasons. As each of the dependent claims include at least the features of the independent claim upon which it depends, each of the dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

In addition to the above, the dependent claims recite additional features which are nowhere disclosed by the cited art. For example, claim 7 recites that the script is configured to provide the input at a predetermined time. In view of the discussion above, it is noted that the input provided by the script is provided in lieu of user input. There is nothing in the cited art which suggests such a mechanism providing the automated input at a predetermined time. In fact, the input described in Kikinis is user input – the timing of which by its nature is not predetermined. Further, while it is suggested that the features of claims 8 and 9 are disclosed by Kikinis at col. 7, line 38 – col. 8, line 22, Applicant can find no mention of storing the input in a message queue or any such disclosure.

Concerning claim 10, it is further recited that the script provides automated input to cause the display of the added content – and this input which is provided further indicates a level of added content to be provided. In Kikinis, there is no such disclosure. Rather, in Kikinis a user provides input to activate an icon or region, which in turn

causes the display of a web page. There is no teaching or suggestion that the input which causes the display of the web page further indicates a level of any sort. While a user may repeatedly provide input to browse multiple web pages, this is not equivalent to the recited features.

Applicant believes the application to be in condition for allowance. However, should the examiner believe issues remain, the below signed representative would greatly appreciate, and requests, a telephone interview at (512) 853-886 to facilitate a speedy resolution.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5266-03400/RDR.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Postcard

Respectfully submitted,

Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
    Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 9/30/05